arXiv:1407.7379v1 [math.PR] 28 Jul 2014

A NOTE ON THE BALLISTIC MOTION OF INTERFACES IN A FIELD OF UNBOUNDED OBSTACLES

PATRICK W. DONDL AND MICHAEL SCHEUTZOW

Abstract. We consider a discretized version of the quenched Edwards-Wilkinson model for the propagation of a driven interface through a random field of obstacles. Our model consists of a system of ordinary differential equations on a d-dimensional lattice coupled by the discrete Laplacian. At each lattice point, the system is subject to a constant driving force and a random obstacle force impeding free propagation. The obstacle force depends on the current state of the solution and thus renders the problem non-linear. For independent and identically distributed obstacle strengths with exponential moment we prove ballistic propagation of the interface if the driving force is large enough.

1. Introduction and the main result

In this article, we consider a semi-discrete model for the evolution of a driven interface subject to line tension in a random, heterogeneous, quenched environment. We prove that if the driving force is large enough then such an interface propagates with a positive velocity—even if the random environment contains obstacles of arbitrarily large strength.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mathbf{P})$ be a probability space and consider the following lattice differential equation for the height $u_i \colon [0,\infty) \times \Omega \to \mathbf{R}$ of the $d \in \mathbf{N}$ dimensional interface in an ambient space of dimension $d+1$,

$$\dot{u}_i(t,\omega) = \Delta_1 u_i(t,\omega) - f_i(u_i(t,\omega),\omega) + F, \tag{1.1}$$

where $i \in \mathbf{Z}^d$, $t \geq 0$, and $\omega \in \Omega$, $F \geq 0$. The initial condition is $u_i(0) = 0$. The operator Δ_1 denotes the discrete d-dimensional Laplacian operator, namely $\Delta_1 u_i = \sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}^d : \|k-i\|_1 = 1} (u_k - u_i)$, where $\|\cdot\|_1$ denotes the discrete 1-norm. The one-dimensional setting was discussed in [6], in this note we generalize our results to arbitrary dimension, albeit only for the (semi-)discrete evolution.

Date: July 29, 2014.

We assume that $f_i : \mathbf{R} \times \Omega \to [0, \infty)$, $i \in \mathbf{Z}^d$ are independent and identically distributed functions such that the map $(y, \omega) \mapsto f_0(y, \omega)$ is measurable with respect to the product of the Borel-σ algebra on $\mathbf{R}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ and the map $y \mapsto f_0(y, \omega)$ is locally Lipschitz for almost all $\omega \in \Omega$. Furthermore, we assume that $f_i(0, \omega) = 0$.

Remark 1.1. Disregarding infinitely fast growing unphysical solutions, these assumptions guarantee that equation (1.1) above admits a unique solution with non-negative velocity for every i and that the solution depends measurably on ω for each $t \geq 0$. The solution furthermore admits a comparison principle.

The main further assumption on the f_i is that they admit a finite exponential moment. As opposed to some other requirements, like independence, this assumption is central to our proof. Under these conditions, we can prove our main result.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume in addition to the above requirements that there exists $\lambda > 0$ such that*

$$\beta := \sup_{j \in \mathbf{N}_0} \mathbf{E} \exp \left\{ \lambda \left\lceil \sup_{j-.5 \leq y \leq j+.5} f_0(y, \omega) \right\rceil \right\} < \infty,$$

where $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ denotes taking the integer ceiling of the argument. Then there exists a non-decreasing function $V : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ which is not identically zero and which depends on λ and β only, such that for all $t > 0$ we have

$$\mathbf{E} \dot{u}_0(t) \geq V(F)$$

and therefore

$$\mathbf{E} \frac{u_0(t)}{t} \geq V(F).$$

Specifically, we can choose

$$V(F) = \sup_{\mu > \lambda} \frac{1}{\mu} \left(\lambda(\lfloor F \rfloor - 2d) - \log \beta - \max \left\{ \log \frac{2}{\mu - \lambda}, \log 2e \right\} \right),$$

where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ denotes taking the integer floor of the argument.

The proof is split in two parts, first a discrete result arguing that there can be no discretized interface whose average velocity is small. The second part is an application of this result to the coupled systems of ODEs.

Remark 1.3. Taking μ large for small values of F, one can see that $V(F) \geq 0$ for all $F > 0$. Furthermore, as F becomes large, one can take μ closer to λ to see that there exists a constant C, depending only on λ, β, and d, such that $V(F) \geq F - \frac{1}{\lambda} \log F - C$ for all $F > 1$.

The main theorem also implies the following almost sure result for the point-wise velocity, excluding the existence of stationary solutions.

Corollary 1.4. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1.2 we also have*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{u_0(t_n)}{t_n} \geq V(F) \quad \textit{almost surely}$$

along any deterministic sequence of times $t_n \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$.

A model very similar to the one considered here was recently discussed in [1]. As opposed to our model, they use a fully discrete evolution, where in each time-step the system advances by one unit at every point where the total force is positive. While some of their results are comparable to ours, they use a rigorous renormalization group approach to prove that in their model (assuming also uniformly bounded obstacles), an interface is either completely blocked (in the sense that a non-negative stationary solution exists) or that it propagates ballistically, i.e., there is no intermediate regime of sub-ballistic propagation. In more general models, like the one here, this question remains open. In particular, for the present model, we can only prove that there exist two critical values for the driving force: if the driving force is below the first value, the interface becomes stuck for all times. If, on the other hand, the driving force is above the second value the interface propagates with finite velocity. The first result is a simple adaptation of our methods in [5, 4] and the second part is proved here.

Generally, problems of the present form (whether fully discrete, partially discrete, or fully continuous) have received considerable interest in the physics community (see for example [7, 9, 8, 2]). Many connections to questions arising from physics are discussed in the aforementioned article by Bodineau and Teixeira [1], as well as in [3], where the first rigorous result on non-existence of stationary states was derived.

The article is organized as follows. In section 2, we show non-existence of states whose velocity is too small. In the following section 3, we apply this result to prove our theorem. We finish with some conclusions and an outlook in section 4.

2. Nonexistence of slow paths

In this section, we prove the central lemma stating that in a fully discrete version of our model, one can with probability one not find any function whose average velocity is too small. Let thus now $\bar{f}_i(j,\omega) := \lceil \sup_{j-.5\leq y\leq j+.5} f_i(y,\omega) \rceil$ defined for all $j \in \mathbf{Z}, i \in \mathbf{Z}^d$. For convenience, we begin by introducing some notation.

Notation 2.1. We use the following abbreviations.

- $Q_k := \{-k+1, \dots, k-1\}^d$, the d-dimensional cube of sites in $\mathbf{Z}^d$ of side-length $2k-1$,
- $\mathcal{B}_k := \sigma(\{\bar{f}_i : i \in Q_k\})$, the σ-algebra generated by the random functions in Q_k,
- $A \in \mathbf{N}$, any fixed number, later to be taken as the integer ceiling of an *a priori* bound on the maximal value the functions u_i, solutions of (1.1) can take at time t,
- $P(\omega) := \{w \colon \mathbf{Z}^d \to \{0, \dots, A\}$, such that $\Delta_1 w_i - \bar{f}_i(w_i, \omega) + F \geq 0$ for all $i \in Z^d\}$, the set of admissible functions,
- $P_k(\omega) := \{w \colon Q_{k+1} \to \{0, \dots, A\}$, such that $\Delta_1 w_i - \bar{f}_i(w_i, \omega) + F \geq 0$ for all $i \in Q_k\}$, the set of admissible functions within a cube Q_{k+1},
- $c_{k,d} = |Q_{k+1} \setminus Q_k| = (2k+1)^d - (2k-1)^d$, the size of the boundary layer around Q_k,
- $N_{m,j} = \binom{j+m-1}{m-1}$, the number of ways $j \in \mathbf{N}_0$ can be represented as the sum of m (ordered) non-negative integers.

Lemma 2.2. *For each $F \in \mathbf{N}_0$, there exists a set Ω_0 of full measure such that for any $\omega \in \Omega_0$ and any function $w \in P(\omega)$ we have*

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{|Q_k|} \sum_{i \in Q_k} \left(\Delta_1 w_i - \bar{f}_i(w_i, \omega) + F\right) \geq \overline{V}(F),$$

where $\overline{V}$ can be taken as

$$\overline{V}(F) = \sup_{\mu > \lambda} \frac{1}{\mu} \left(\lambda F - \log \beta - \max\left\{ \log \frac{2}{\mu - \lambda}, \log 2e \right\} \right), \tag{2.1}$$

and β and λ are defined in Theorem 1.2.

Proof. Fix $\mu > \lambda$ and consider for $k \geq 1$ the sequence of random variables

$$Y_k := \sum_{w \in P_k} \exp\big\{ \lambda \sum_{\substack{i \in Q_k \\ r \notin Q_k \\ \|i-r\|_1 = 1}} (w_r - w_i) - \mu \sum_{i \in Q_k} \left(\Delta_1 w_i - \bar{f}_i(w_i, \omega) + F\right) \big\}.$$

The basic underlying idea in this definition is the following. We will show, using a martingale argument, that for sufficiently large F the sequence Y_k almost surely vanishes exponentially in the size of the box Q_k. For this decrease we can also establish a rate. Such a decrease, however, implies that as we look at larger and larger boxes around the origin, either the sum of the normal derivatives at the boundary of the box (the first term in the exponential) has to become large and negative quickly, or the sum of the velocities (the second term in the exponential) in Q_k has to increase with a rate related to the one with

which Y_k vanishes. The first option is excluded by the non-negativity of w. The second option yields the average velocity (with a negative sign), after taking a logarithm and using the sum over all paths as an estimate for the supremum over all possible paths.

The first step in the proof is to relate the change in normal derivatives as k increases to the addition of terms in the sum over the Laplcian. We use a discrete version of the divergence theorem, namely that

$$\sum_{\substack{i\in Q_k\\ r\notin Q_k\\ \|i-r\|_1=1}} (w_r - w_i) = \sum_{i\in Q_k} \Delta_1 w_i,$$

and thus

$$Y_k = \sum_{w\in P_k} \exp\big\{(\lambda-\mu)\sum_{i\in Q_k}\Delta_1 w_i - \mu\sum_{i\in Q_k}\big(-\bar{f}_i(w_i,\omega)+F\big)\big\}.$$

A calculation now yields

$$\mathbf{E}(Y_{k+1}|\mathcal{B}_k) = \sum_{w\in P_k}\Bigg(\exp\big\{(\lambda-\mu)\sum_{i\in Q_k}\Delta_1 w_i - \mu\sum_{i\in Q_k}\big(-\bar{f}_i(w_i,\omega)+F\big)\big\}\cdot$$
$$\mathbf{E}\sum_{\substack{\text{extensions}\\ \text{of } w \text{ to } P_{k+1}}} \exp\big\{\lambda\sum_{i\in Q_{k+1}\setminus Q_k}\Delta_1 w_i - \mu\sum_{i\in Q_{k+1}\setminus Q_k}(\Delta_1 w_i - \bar{f}_i(w_i)+F)\big\}\Bigg),$$

where the sum in the second line is taken over all admissible extensions of w to functions in P_{k+1}. Taking now

(2.2)
$$\gamma_k := \sup_{w\in P_k}\mathbf{E}\sum_{\substack{\text{extensions}\\ \text{of } w \text{ to } P_{k+1}}} \exp\big\{\lambda\sum_{i\in Q_{k+1}\setminus Q_k}\Delta_1 w_i - \mu\sum_{i\in Q_{k+1}\setminus Q_k}(\Delta_1 w_i - \bar{f}_i(w_i)+F)\big\},$$

with the sum as above over all possible extensions, we get

$$\mathbf{E}(Y_{k+1}|\mathcal{B}_k) \le \gamma_k Y_k, \quad \text{for } k\ge 1. \tag{2.3}$$

In order to estimate γ_k further, we need to rearrange and count the number of possible extensions. In the sum over all admissible extensions we thus first take all extensions such that $\sum_{i\in Q_{k+1}\setminus Q_k}(\Delta_1 w_i - \bar{f}_i(w_i)+F) = j\in\mathbf{N}_0$, calling these "admissible extensions with velocity j" and then sum over all $j\ge 0$. In the case that there does not exist an admissible extension with velocity j, we take the sum to be

zero. This yields

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_k &= \sup_{w\in P_k} \mathbf{E}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{\text{adm. ext.}\\ \text{with vel. } j}} \exp\big\{\lambda \sum_{i\in Q_{k+1}\setminus Q_k} \Delta_1 w_i - \\ &\qquad\qquad \mu \sum_{i\in Q_{k+1}\setminus Q_k} \big(\Delta_1 w_i - \bar f_i(w_i) + F\big)\big\} \\ &= \sup_{w\in P_k} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-j(\mu-\lambda)}\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda c_{k,d}F}\, \mathbf{E} \sum_{\substack{\text{adm. ext.}\\ \text{with vel. } j}} \exp\big\{\lambda \sum_{i\in Q_{k+1}\setminus Q_k} \bar f_i(w_i)\big\} \\ &\le \sup_{w\in P_k} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-j(\mu-\lambda)}\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda c_{k,d}F}\beta^{c_{k,d}} \sup_{\omega\in\Omega} M_{j,k,d}(\omega, w|_{Q_{k+1}}),\end{aligned}$$

where $M_{j,k,d}(\omega, w|_{Q_{k+1}})$ is the of the number of admissible extensions with velocity j, depending on the realization of the random field f and on w from the previous step. We also note that w_i for $i \in Q_{k+1}\setminus Q_k$ is a fixed value inside the supremum, which allows us to use the assumption on the exponential moment of f.

The idea for estimating $M_{j,k,d}$ now is the following: given j, there are no more than $N_{c_{k,d},j}$ possibilities to distribute these velocities on the $c_{k,d}$ sites. With all velocities fixed, for most sites in $Q_{k+2}\setminus Q_{k+1}$ where the extension lives, the function value is determined due to the fact that ω and the velocity can be used to calculate the discrete Laplacian (if such a choice exists at all). The number of sites where we still have freedom is $\mathcal{O}(d-2)$. We thus aim for an estimate of the type $\sup M_{j,k,d} \le N_{c_{k,d},j}\cdot 1\cdot (A+1)^{C^{d-2}}$.

First notice that in dimension $d=1$, there is no freedom to choose any additional values for the extension if the Laplacian at the boundaries is given. Consider thus the case $d\ge 2$. Each given function value and the Laplacian on the site can be used to write one independent linear equation for the function values on the extension, therefore the remaining number of sites with freedom is $c_{k+1,d} - c_{k,d} =: \xi_{k,d}$. See the illustration in Figure 1 for the two-dimensional case. Note that the number of choices for each of those nodes is limited to at most $A+1$, and that $\xi_{k,d} = \mathcal{O}(k^{d-2})$.

Since the above estimate was independent of $w\in P_k$ and on $\omega\in\Omega$, this yields

$$\gamma_k \le \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathrm{e}^{-j(\mu-\lambda)}\mathrm{e}^{-\lambda c_{k,d}F}\beta^{c_{k,d}} N_{c_{k,d},j}(A+1)^{\xi_{k,d}}.$$



FIGURE 1. Illustration of the extension process and the points where there is a freedom to choose the function value of the extension when the Laplacian is fixed.

Using the estimate $N_{m,j} \leq \frac{(j+m-1)^{m-1}}{(m-1)!} \leq \frac{2^{m-2}}{(m-1)!}\,(j^{m-1} + (m-1)^{m-1})$, the sum can be bounded as follows. We have

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} N_{c_{k,d},j} \mathrm{e}^{-(\mu-\lambda)j} \leq \frac{2^{c_{k,d}-2}}{(c_{k,d}-1)!} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j^{c_{k,d}-1} \mathrm{e}^{-(\mu-\lambda)j} + (c_{k,d}-1)^{c_{k,d}-1} \frac{1}{1-\mathrm{e}^{-(\mu-\lambda)}} \right),$$

which, using

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j^{c_{k,d}-1} \mathrm{e}^{-(\mu-\lambda)j} &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \int_{j}^{j+1} x^{c_{k,d}-1} \mathrm{e}^{-(\mu-\lambda)(x-1)} \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \frac{\mathrm{e}^{\mu-\lambda}}{(\mu-\lambda)^{c_{k,d}}} \Gamma(c_{k,d}) \\ &= \frac{\mathrm{e}^{\mu-\lambda}}{(\mu-\lambda)^{c_{k,d}}} (c_{k,d}-1)! \end{aligned}$$

yields

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} N_{c_{k,d},j} \mathrm{e}^{-(\mu-\lambda)j} \leq \max \left\{ \frac{2^{c_{k,d}} \mathrm{e}^{\mu-\lambda}}{(\mu-\lambda)^{c_{k,d}}}, \frac{(2c_{k,d}-2)^{c_{k,d}-1}}{(c_{k,d}-1)!} \frac{1}{1-\mathrm{e}^{-(\mu-\lambda)}} \right\}$$

We thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \log \gamma_k \leq \xi_{k,d} \log(A+1) + c_{k,d}(\log \beta - \lambda F) + \\ + \max \Big\{ \mu - \lambda + c_{k,d} \log \frac{2}{\mu-\lambda}, \\ (c_{k,d}-1) \log 2\mathrm{e} + \log C - \log \left(1 - \mathrm{e}^{-(\mu-\lambda)}\right) \Big\} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant C.

Equation (2.3) together with the boundedness of γ_k and the almost sure finiteness of Y_1 establishes that $\frac{Y_k}{\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}\gamma_j}$ for $k \geq 2$ is a non-negative supermartingale. From Doob's martingale convergence theorem we therefore find that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{Y_k}{\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}\gamma_j} = C(\omega) < \infty$$

on a set $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega$ of full measure. Note furthermore that

$$\frac{\log Y_k}{\mu\,|Q_k|} \geq \sup_{w\in P_k}\Big\{\frac{\lambda}{\mu\,|Q_k|}\sum_{\substack{i\in Q_k\\ r\notin Q_k\\ \|i-r\|_1=1}}(w_r - w_i) - \frac{1}{|Q_k|}\sum_{i\in Q_k}\big(\Delta_1 w_i - \bar{f}_i(w_i,\omega) + F\big)\Big\}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&\inf_{w\in P(\omega)} \liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{|Q_k|}\sum_{i\in Q_k}\big(\Delta_1 w_i - \bar{f}_i(w_i,\omega) + F\big)\\
&\geq \liminf_{k\to\infty}\frac{-1}{\mu\,|Q_k|}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\log\gamma_j\\
&\geq \frac{1}{\mu}\left(\lambda F - \log\beta - \max\Big\{\log\frac{2}{\mu-\lambda}, \log 2\mathrm{e}\Big\}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that $|Q_k| = \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_{i,d}$ and dropped all terms that are of lower order than $|Q_k|$. In particular, these are the terms in γ_i that are of lower order than $c_{i,d}$ as well as $C(\omega)$ and the first sum inside the exponent in Y_k, which vanishes in the limit due to the boundedness of w. This proves the lemma. □

3. Application to the continuous evolution problem

The lemma from the above section allows us to complete the proof of the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Assume that the statement in the theorem is untrue. Then there exist $F \geq 0$ and some t_0 such that $\mathbf{E}\dot{u}_0(t_0) < V(F)$. By our independence assumptions on the field f, the processes $u_i(t_0)$, $\dot{u}_i(t_0)$, $i \in \mathbf{Z}^d$ are stationary and ergodic and take values in $[0,\infty)$. We write u_i instead of $u_i(t_0)$. By Birkhoff's ergodic theorem, we have

$$\mathbf{E}\dot{u}_0 = \lim_{k\to\infty}\frac{1}{|Q_k|}\sum_{i\in Q_k}(\Delta_1 u_i - f_i(u_i,\omega) + F)$$

almost surely. However, taking w_i to be u_i rounded to the closest integer, we find

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{|Q_k|} \sum_{i\in Q_k} (\Delta_1 u_i - f_i(u_i,\omega) + F) \geq$$

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{|Q_k|} \sum_{i\in Q_k} \left(\Delta_1 w_i - 2d - \bar{f}_i(w_i,\omega) + \lfloor F \rfloor\right) \geq \overline{V}(\lfloor F \rfloor - 2d) = V(F)$$

by Lemma 2.2. □

The almost sure statement about the velocities can be derived by the following argument.

Proof of Corollary 1.4. Consider, for a fixed sequence of times $t_n \to \infty$, the random variables

$$A_i(\omega) := \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{u_i(t_n)}{t_n}, \quad i \in \mathbf{Z}^d,$$

noting that A_i is stationary, ergodic and bounded from above and below by F and 0, respectively. Furthermore, we have $\mathbf{E}(A_i) \geq V(F)$, by Fatou's lemma. By the non-negativity of the velocity and f_i, it follows that $\Delta_1 u_i(t,\omega) \geq -F$ for all $t \geq 0$ and almost all ω, and therefore $\Delta_1 A_i(\omega) \geq 0$ for almost all ω.

Now let $\xi_i := \mathbf{E}\Delta_1 A_i$. By stationarity, ξ_i is constant in i and we write $\xi := \xi_0$. By the discrete divergence theorem, boundedness of A_i and ergodicity of $\Delta_1 A_i$ imply that $\xi = 0$ and since $\Delta_1 A_i(\omega) \geq 0$ for almost all ω we have $\Delta_1 A_i(\omega) = 0$ almost surely and for all $i \in \mathbf{Z}^d$. This yields that $A_i(\omega)$ is a bounded, ergodic, and stationary process whose realizations are almost surely harmonic. Thus, $A_i(\omega)$ is almost surely constant in i and therefore $A_0(\omega)$ is almost surely equal to its expected value. The desired result follows. □

4. Conclusions

In this note, we have extended our depinning result from [6] to the case of arbitrary dimension in a semi-discrete model of coupled ordinary differential equations. A careful inspection of the proof shows that one can furthermore extend our results to obstacle strengths coupled over a finite distance: if there exists $L > 0$ such that sets of obstacles are independent if their distance (in the first d-dimensions) is above L, one can still obtain similar estimates for the velocity.

The case of the fully continuous model on $\mathbf{R}^d$, however, remains open. Further unresolved issues are whether we have $\liminf_{t\to\infty} \frac{u_0(t)}{t} > 0$ almost surely for sufficiently large F, the relaxation of the result to

obstacles with fat tails, as well as whether a regime of sub-ballistic propagation (i.e., vanishing velocity, but propagation of the interface to $+\infty$ everywhere) can exist in our models. As mentioned above, for a specific fully discrete evolution model this last question was answered recently [1].

References

[1] T Bodineau and A Teixeira. Interface motion in random media. *arXiv:*1311.5138 [math.PR], 2013.

[2] S Brazovskii and T Nattermann. Pinning and sliding of driven elastic systems: from domain walls to charge density waves. *Advances in Physics*, 53(2):177–252, 2004.

[3] J Coville, N Dirr, and S Luckhaus. Non-existence of positive stationary solutions for a class of semi-linear PDEs with random coefficients. *Networks and Heterogeneous Media*, 5(4):745–763, 2009.

[4] N Dirr, P W Dondl, G R Grimmett, A E Holroyd, and M Scheutzow. Lipschitz percolation. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 15:14–21, 2010.

[5] N Dirr, P W Dondl, and M Scheutzow. Pinning of interfaces in random media. *Interfaces and Free Boundaries. Mathematical Modelling, Analysis and Computation*, 13(3):411–421, 2011.

[6] P W Dondl and M Scheutzow. Positive speed of propagation in a semilinear parabolic interface model with unbounded random coefficients. *Networks and Heterogeneous Media*, 7(1):137–150, 2012.

[7] M Kardar. Nonequilibrium dynamics of interfaces and lines. *Physics Reports-Review Section Of Physics Letters*, 301(1-3):85–112, 1998.

[8] O Narayan and D S Fisher. Threshold critical dynamics of driven interfaces in random media. *Physical Review B*, 48(10):7030–7042, 1993.

[9] T Nattermann, S Stepanow, L H Tang, and H Leschhorn. Dynamics of interface depinning in a disordered medium. *Journal De Physique II*, 2(8):1483–1488, 1992.